

This is in response to the Office Action mailed December 9, 2002.

REMARKS

The formal drawings required by the Examiner are submitted herewith.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-18 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) over Henson, US6,167,383. It is submitted that the Henson patent fails to disclose all of the elements of the present claimed invention, and fails to disclose the claimed novel combination of such elements.

The present invention relates to a business method and system for the purpose of compensating sellers of computer components for their overall great expenditures in developing systems for configuring computer systems for purchasers. Such costs are related to overall quantities of the computer components sold. Thus, it is important to recognize when considering the present invention with respect to the prior art that the business method invention is not the optimizing of the computer system offered for sale to the needs of the individual purchaser. Rather, the invention involves A) the tracking of the quantities of each computer component sold by the seller to all of the purchasers responsive to a set of rules which determine the customers' component needs and allocate the computer components. Then, B) optimizing quantities of each component based upon the seller's business needs. Based upon the seller's needs, selected purchasers are then offered modifications to the customers' above determined and allocated needs to thereby reconcile the individual purchaser's computer component needs with the sellers' overall component sales needs.

Like the method of the present invention, the Henson method does prompt the purchaser to make a sequence of entries. Henson, in response to these entries, then presents the purchaser with a set of systems but each system in the set is optimized according to the needs of the purchaser. The purchaser may then choose the optimized system which best suits his needs. With the Henson method, there is no concern whatsoever with the overall business needs of the seller. Consequently, Henson does not disclose means for A) the tracking of the quantities of each computer component sold by the seller to all of the purchasers. If Henson could even be said to track quantities of any computer component, he would only track the number of components which would go into the system optimized to the one individual purchaser. Also Henson does not disclose means for B) optimizing quantities of each tracked component based upon the seller's business needs. Henson is in no way concerned with the seller's business needs, and, therefore, does not consider possible modification of the quantities of each of the tracked components allocated to a plurality of the seller's purchasers. Here again, Henson is only focused on the optimum needs of an individual purchaser.

Claims 2, 8, and 14 may be further distinguished over Henson in that the seller is enabled to offer financial incentives to purchasers for accepting modifications in the computer components allocated to the purchaser based upon the optimization of the seller's business needs. These seller's needs are determined by the tracked quantities of the computer components sold to all of the plurality of purchasers. There are no direct financial incentives offered to purchasers in Henson based upon any quantities of tracked computer components sold to a plurality of

PATENT
09/282,615

purchasers mentioned in Henson.

With the above major deficiencies in its teaching, Applicants fails to see how the Henson patent can provide the basis for anticipatory reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(a).

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-18 are now in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

J. B. Kraft
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 19,226
(512) 473-2303

PLEASE MAIL ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Leslie Van Leeuwen
IPLaw Dept. - IMAD 4054
IBM Corporation
11400 Burnet Road
Austin, Texas 78758